

AD-A246 064



2

TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-3307

BRL

EXPONENTIAL ERROR BOUNDS ON CODES
FOR NOISY CHANNELS WITH INACCURATELY
KNOWN STATISTICS AND FOR
GENERALIZED DECISION RULES

D. KAZAKOS
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. B. COOPER III
U.S. ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY

JANUARY 1992

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.

U.S. ARMY LABORATORY COMMAND

BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

92-03886



92

NOTICES

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. DO NOT return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE January 1992	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final, Oct 1990-Oct 1991	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Exponential Error Bounds on Codes for Noisy Channels With Inaccurately Known Statistics and for Generalized Decision Rules			5. FUNDING NUMBERS RDTE 1L161102AH43	
6. AUTHOR(S) D. Kazakos* and A. B. Cooper III				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER BRL-TR-3307	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES *Dimitri Kazakos of the Electrical Engineering Department at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, is a National Research Council Senior Research Associate for the Ballistic Research Laboratory.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) Generalized decoding decision rules provide added flexibility in a decoding scheme and some advantages. In a generalized decoding decision rule, the following possibilities are considered: 1) The decoder has the option of not deciding at all, or rejecting all estimates. This is termed an erasure; 2) The decoder has the option of putting out more than one estimate. The resulting output is called a list. Only if the correct code word is not on the list do we have a list error. Forney developed error bounds in his seminal paper of 1968 in which he used Gallager's ingenious 1965 method of bounding error probabilities. In this paper, we consider another realistic factor, the lack of exact knowledge of the channel statistics. We assume a mismatch between the true channel transition probabilities and the nominal probabilities used in the decoding metric. We then develop error bounds under mismatch for generalized decision rules. We also establish conditions under which the error probabilities converge to zero exponentially with the block length, in spite of the presence of mismatch.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Information theory; error bounds; mismatched channels; erasure decoding; list decoding; decoding			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 20	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. GENERALIZED DECODING	2
3. BOUNDS UNDER MISMATCH	7
4. REFERENCES	15
DISTRIBUTION	17



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental theorems of information theory is Shannon's coding theorem (Shannon and Weaver 1949) for noisy channels. Using random coding arguments, Shannon discovered the original version, and later, Fano (1961) stated it in a stronger version:

For any stationary channel with finite memory, a channel capacity C can be defined having the following significance. For any binary transmission rate R smaller than C , the probability of error per digit can be made arbitrarily small by properly designing the channel encoder and decoder. Conversely, the probability of error cannot be made arbitrarily small when R is greater than C .

The average error probability of the best block codes on the noisy channel can be bounded as follows:

$$P_e \leq e^{-nE_r(R)},$$

where n is the length of a code word and $E_r(R)$, the random coding exponent, is positive for all rates R less than capacity C . The existence of such exponential error bounds indicates a useful communications channel. Gallager (1965) pioneered a very elegant derivation of this random coding exponent, using a novel upper bound to the error probability. In another paper, Forney (1968) generalized Gallager's exponential error bounds for generalized decoding schemes, namely decoding with erasure, list decoding, and decision feedback schemes. Much of this work uses random coding arguments in which each input message is represented by a code word constructed by selecting n symbols from an alphabet of independent, identically distributed symbols. The error probability of the channel and coding scheme is averaged over the ensemble of all randomly chosen codes, and there must be at least one nonrandom code with error probability as small as the ensemble average.

In all of the previously mentioned papers and in most literature on information theory, the assumption is that the statistical model of the noisy channel, expressed by the probability transition matrix, is completely known (i.e., that the channel is statistically describable). The capacities of channels which are not so describable have been investigated by Blackwell,

Breiman, and Thomasian (1960), Stiglitz (1967), and many others. A channel for which the transition matrix can change with each use is often known as an arbitrarily-varying channel (Blackwell, Breiman, and Thomasian 1960). Of potentially practical interest is the channel, also not statistically describable, in which the probability transition matrix remains fixed over one code word. This is the so-called "fixed unknown" channel (Blackwell, Breiman, and Thomasian 1960), now called the "compound" channel (Gallager 1965).

By another approach, followed by Kazakos (1981) and elsewhere, various authors analyze the performance of transmission through noisy channels when an inaccurate version of the probability transmission matrix is used by the decoder. This is termed "mismatch." Kazakos (1981) derived upper and lower bounds for transmission through channels in the presence of mismatch. Kazakos (1981) also found the necessary and sufficient conditions for the error probability of a random code to converge to zero with increasing block length. They were expressed in terms of distances between the actual and assumed channel probability transition matrices. In the present paper, we obtain exponential error bounds for generalized decoding schemes of the type considered by Forney (1968) but for the case of mismatch.

2. GENERALIZED DECODING

We consider a noisy, discrete channel chosen to be memoryless for the present report. Generalizations will follow in subsequent work. Let

$$P = \{P(y_k = b \mid x_k = \alpha) = p_{b\alpha}; \alpha = 1, \dots, A; b = 1, \dots, B\}$$

$$\sum_{b=1}^B p_{b\alpha} = 1$$

be the transition probability matrix of the noisy channel. Let us consider a block code of block size n , with the following code words:

$$\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_M\}; M = e^{nR}; X_m = (x_{m1}, \dots, x_{mn}),$$

where R = rate of the code. The probability of receiving a block $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ when X_m was transmitted is as follows:

$$P(y|X_m) = \prod_{j=1}^n P(y_j | x_{mj}) . \quad (1)$$

We will assume that all entries of P are positive, i.e.,

$$p_o = \min_{\alpha, b} p_{b\alpha} > 0 . \quad (2)$$

Ordinarily, maximum likelihood decoding selects the message m that maximizes the likelihood $P(y|X_m)$. We assume that the prior probabilities π_i of the M code words are equal: $\pi_i = M^{-1}$. Maximum likelihood decoding divides the decision space S into disjoint regions $\{R_1, \dots, R_M\}$ by the following:

$$y \in R_m \text{ iff } P(y|X_m) > P(y|X_v) \text{ for all } v \neq m. \quad (3)$$

In the present report, we will assume that an inaccurate version Q of the true transition probability matrix P is used in decoding. Let

$$Q = \{ Q(y_k = b | x_k = \alpha) = q_{b\alpha}; \alpha = 1, \dots, A; b = 1, \dots, B \} \quad (4)$$

be the entries of the nominal probability transition matrix used in decoding. Naturally, $q_{b\alpha} \neq p_{b\alpha}$ for at least one pair of entries.

For maximum likelihood decoding under mismatch, the decision space S is separated into a different set of disjoint regions $\{\tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_M\}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^M \tilde{R}_i = S$ and $\tilde{R}_i \cap \tilde{R}_j = \emptyset$. These regions are defined by the following:

$$y \in R_m \text{ iff } Q(y|X_m) \geq Q(y|X_v) \text{ for all } v \neq m. \quad (5)$$

(As indicated earlier, this is one form of the fixed unknown channel [Blackwell, Breiman, and Thomasian 1960].)

Two generalized decision rules were considered by Forney (1968). The first one is the inclusion of an erasure option. In this case, an additional region R_0 is included to represent the event that no transmitted message is to be assigned to the received symbol because the value of the latter cannot be known reliably; if $y \in R_0$ we declare an erasure. Thus, $M + 1$ outcomes are possible. The $M + 1$ regions $\{R_0, R_1, \dots, R_M\}$ are disjoint and cover all the space S :

$$\bigcup_{j=0}^M R_j = S, R_i \cap R_j = \emptyset, i, j = 0, 1, \dots, M.$$

Let E_2 be the event of an undetected error; this is the event that $y \in R_m$ and that some code word X_k , $k \neq m$ was actually transmitted. That is, the decoder believes that it has correctly decoded because it has produced a code word according to the decoding algorithm. However, the code word thus produced is not the code word that was transmitted. The probability of E_2 can be expressed as follows:

$$P[E_2] = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{y \in R_m} \sum_{k \neq m} P(y|X_k) P(X_k). \quad (6)$$

Let E_1 be the event in which the received word y does not fall in the decision region R_m corresponding to the transmitted code word X_m ; the probability of E_1 is as follows:

$$P[E_1] = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{y \notin R_m} P(y|X_m) P(X_m). \quad (7)$$

If E_1 occurs, either an undetected error or an erasure must ensue; hence, the probability of an erasure is as follows:

$$P[\theta] = P[E_1] - P[E_2] \geq 0 .$$

The problem in choosing the regions $\{R_1, \dots, R_M\}$ is now formulated. We wish to minimize $P[E_1]$ for a given $P[E_2]$ or vice versa. It is clear that increasing R_m will increase $P[E_2]$ but decrease $P[E_1]$; hence, we have a variation of the Neyman-Pearson problem (van Trees 1968).

The second type of generalized decoding is list decoding. Here, the decision regions $\{R_1, \dots, R_M\}$ overlap; hence, for each received word y , a list of code words is produced. The list contains at least one code word; the size of the list varies, as will be explained. The performance of list decoding is evaluated through two event probabilities. A list error is the event in which the transmitted code word is not on the list or, equivalently, in which the received word y is not in the decision region R_m corresponding to the transmitted code word X_m . This is the event E_1 , with probability given by Equation 7. The second probability, that some code word X_m will be on the list, although some other code word X_k , $k \neq m$ was sent, is as follows:

$$P(X_m \text{ on list and incorrect}) = \sum_{y \in R_m} \sum_{k \neq m} P(y | X_k) P(X_k) .$$

The average number \bar{L} of incorrect code words on the list is as follows:

$$\bar{L} = \sum_{m=1}^M P(X_m \text{ on list and incorrect}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{y \in R_m} \sum_{k \neq m} P(y | X_k) P(X_k) . \quad (8)$$

We observe that the expression (Equation 8) for \bar{L} is identical to the expression (Equation 6) for $P(E_2)$, where $P(E_2)$ is no longer a probability but represents \bar{L} . In the sequel, we will use $P(E_2)$ to denote both cases.

Thus, we have a unified formulation of decoding with erasure and list decoding. Forney (1968) proved that the optimum regions $\{R_1, \dots, R_M\}$ found under the criterion of minimizing Equation 6 under constraint of Equation 7 or vice versa are as follows:

$$R_m = \left\{ y; \left[\sum_{k \neq m} P(y | X_k) P(X_k) \right]^{-1} \cdot P(y | X_m) P(X_m) \geq e^{nT} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where n = block length and T = an arbitrary parameter.

An equivalent way of describing the decision regions (Equation 9) is through the posterior probabilities $P(X_m | y)$.

$$y \in R_m \text{ iff } P(X_m | y) \geq u, \quad (10)$$

where $u = e^{nT} [1 + e^{nT}]^{-1}$.

In ordinary decoding, we decode into the code word X_m for which $P(X_m | y)$ is greatest. With the erasure option, we guess the code word X_m for which $P(X_m | y)$ is greatest, so long as $P(X_m | y) \geq u$, $u \geq 1/2$. This corresponds to $T \geq 0$. With list decoding, to minimize the average list size for a given list error probability, we put on the list all code words for which $P(X_m | y) \geq u$, $u \leq 1/2$. This corresponds to $T < 0$.

Thus, the regions R_m defined by Equation 4 are optimal for regular decoding ($T = 0$), list decoding, ($T < 0$ and overlapping), and decoding with erasure option ($T > 0$). Note that in order to define the decision regions R_m we need to know the probability transition matrix P . In the mismatch situation, we utilize Q instead of P . We assume, for simplicity, from this point on, equal prior probabilities: $P(X_m) = M^{-1}$; hence, the decision regions (under mismatch) are as follows:

$$\tilde{R}_m = \left\{ y; \left[\sum_{k \neq m} Q(y | X_k) \right]^{-1} Q(y | X_m) \geq e^{nT} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

where \tilde{R}_m denotes the decision region based on mismatch. For $Q = P$, we have $\tilde{R}_m = R_m$.

3. BOUNDS UNDER MISMATCH

We will now generalize Forney's upper bounds for the mismatched case. We have the following two probabilities to upperbound:

$$P[E_1] = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{y \in \tilde{R}_m} P(y | X_m), \quad (12)$$

$$P[E_2] = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{y \in \tilde{R}_m} \sum_{k \neq m} P(y | X_k). \quad (13)$$

Let us define the following functions:

$$S_m \triangleq S_m(y) \triangleq \sum_{k \neq m} P(y | X_k),$$

$$Z_m \triangleq Z_m(y) \triangleq \sum_{k \neq m} Q(y | X_k),$$

$$Q_m \triangleq Q(y | X_m),$$

and

$$P_m \triangleq P(y | X_m).$$

Note that

$$\sum_y S_m(y) = \sum_y Z_m(y) = M - 1. \quad (14)$$

Hence, if we divide $S_m(y)$ and $Z_m(y)$ by $M-1$, they become probability distributions; more specifically, they become mixtures of $M-1$ distributions, with equal mixing parameters.

If we define the indicator function as follows:

$$\Phi_m(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } y \in \tilde{R}_m, \text{ i.e., for } Z_m^{-1} Q_m e^{-n\tau} \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

then, the expressions for $P[E_1]$, $P[E_2]$, can be written as follows:

$$V_1 \triangleq P[E_1] = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y [1 - \Phi_m(y)] P(y | X_m), \quad (16)$$

$$V_2 \triangleq (M-1)^{-1} P[E_2] = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y \Phi_m(y) \cdot S_m(y) (M-1)^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

Note that

$$\sum_y S_m(y) \cdot (M-1)^{-1} = 1 \text{ and } S_m(y) (M-1)^{-1} \geq 0.$$

Hence, the normalized S_m behaves like a probability distribution function. We observe that

$$1 - V_1 = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y \Phi_m(y) P(y | X_m), \quad (18)$$

$$1 - V_2 = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y [1 - \Phi_m(y)] (M-1)^{-1} \cdot S_m(y). \quad (19)$$

For $s > 0$, we have the following bounds:

$$\Phi_m(y) \leq \left(Z_m^{-1} Q_m e^{-n\tau} \right)^s, \quad (20)$$

$$1 - \Phi_m(y) \leq \left(Q_m^{-1} Z_m e^{nT} \right)^s . \quad (21)$$

Using the bounds of Equations 20 and 21 in Equations 16, 17, 18, and 19, we obtain the following inequalities:

$$V_1 \leq M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y \left(Q_m^{-1} Z_m e^{nT} \right)^s P_m , \quad (22)$$

$$1 - V_1 \leq M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y \left(Z_m^{-1} Q_m e^{-nT} \right)^s P_m , \quad (23)$$

$$V_2 \leq M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y \left(Z_m^{-1} Q_m e^{-nT} \right)^s S_m \cdot (M - 1)^{-1} , \quad (24)$$

$$1 - V_2 \leq M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_y \left(Z_m Q_m^{-1} e^{nT} \right)^s (M - 1)^{-1} \cdot S_m . \quad (25)$$

We define the following functions:

$$g_{1m}(s) = \sum_y \left[(M - 1)^{-1} \cdot Z_m \cdot Q_m^{-1} \right]^s P_m , \quad (26)$$

$$g_{2m}(s) = \sum_y \left[(M - 1) Z_m^{-1} Q_m \right]^s (M - 1)^{-1} \cdot S_m . \quad (27)$$

We then obtain the following inequalities:

$$V_1 \leq M^{-1} e^{nTs} (M - 1)^s \sum_{m=1}^M g_{1m}(s) , \quad (28)$$

$$1 - V_1 \leq M^{-1} e^{-nTs} (M - 1)^{-s} \sum_{m=1}^M g_{1m}(-s) , \quad (29)$$

$$V_2 \leq M^{-1} e^{-nTs} (M-1)^{-s} \sum_{m=1}^M g_{2m}(s), \quad (30)$$

$$1 - V_2 \leq M^{-1} e^{nTs} (M-1)^s \sum_{m=1}^M g_{2m}(-s). \quad (31)$$

We will utilize a form of Jensen's inequality (Korevaar 1968), which states the following:

$$\left[\sum_j \alpha_j^q \right]^{1/q} \leq \sum_j \alpha_j, \quad q \geq 1, \alpha_j \geq 0.$$

If we introduce a new parameter $p \geq s$, we have, by Jensen's inequality, the following:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{1m}(s) &= \sum_y \left\{ \left[(M-1)^{-1} \sum_{k \neq m} Q_k \right]^{s/p} \right\}^p Q_m^{-s} \cdot P_m \\ &\leq \sum_y P_m Q_m^{-s} \left\{ \sum_{k \neq m} \left[(M-1)^{-1} Q_k \right]^{s/p} \right\}^p \\ &\leq \sum_y P_m^{1-s} [P_m Q_m^{-1}]^s \left\{ \sum_{k \neq m} \left[(M-1)^{-1} Q_k \right]^{s/p} \right\}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Let also $q \geq 1-s$. By the same argument,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{2m}(s) &= \sum_y \left[(M-1) Z_m^{-1} Q_m \right]^s (M-1)^{-1} S_m \\ &= \sum_y \left[S_m Z_m^{-1} \right]^s Q_m^s \left[(M-1)^{-1} S_m \right]^{1-s} \\ &= \sum_y \left[S_m Z_m^{-1} \right]^s Q_m^s \left\{ \left[(M-1)^{-1} \sum_{k \neq m} P_k \right]^{(1-s)/q} \right\}^q \\ &\leq \sum_y \left[S_m Z_m^{-1} \right]^s Q_m^s \left\{ \sum_{k \neq m} \left[(M-1)^{-1} P_k \right]^{(1-s)/q} \right\}^q. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

We consider probability transition matrices for which a finite lower bound exists to every entry. Then, there exists a finite number B that is an upper bound to $[P_m Q_m^{-1}]^s$, $[S_m Z_m^{-1}]^s$. We obtain the following upper bounds:

$$g_{1m}(s) \leq B \cdot \sum_y P_m^{1-s} \left\{ \sum_{k \neq m} [(M-1)^{-1} Q_k]^{s/p} \right\}^p, \quad (34)$$

$$g_{2m}(s) \leq B \cdot \sum_y Q_m^s \left\{ \sum_{k \neq m} [(M-1)^{-1} P_k]^{(1-s)/q} \right\}^q. \quad (35)$$

Multiplying by $(M-1)^s$, we find the following:

$$(M-1)^s g_{1m}(s) \leq B \sum_y P_m^{1-s} \left[\sum_{k \neq m} Q_k^{s/p} \right]^p, \quad (36)$$

$$(M-1) \cdot (M-1)^{-s} g_{2m}(s) \leq B \cdot \sum_y Q_m^s \left[\sum_{k \neq m} P_k^{(1-s)/q} \right]^q. \quad (37)$$

Note from Equations 26 and 28 that the products $(M-1)^s g_{1m}(s)$, $(M-1)^{-s} g_{2m}(s)$ appear at the upper bounds; hence, we are interested in bounding them directly.

At this point, we need to resort to random coding arguments. As is customary, and following Gallager's (1965) and Forney's (1968) approaches, we choose a code at random by choosing each input letter of each code word by a random selection in which the probability of choosing input x_k is p_k . Denoting the average by an overbar, a modification of the approach in Forney's paper (Forney 1968) yields the following:

$$(M-1)^s \bar{g}_{1m}(s) \leq B \cdot e^{\rho n R} \cdot \left[\sum_j \left(\sum_k p_k p_{jk}^{1-s} \right) \left(\sum_v p_v q_{jv}^{s/p} \right)^p \right]^n, \quad (38)$$

where

$$P = \{p_{jk}\}, \quad Q = \{q_{jv}\}$$

are the true and assumed channel probability transition matrices, respectively. This is in agreement with Forney's bound if $P = Q$ (matched case) and, hence, $B = 1$.

A similar upper bound is produced for $\{\bar{g}_{2m}(s)\}$:

$$(M-1)(M-1)^{-s}\bar{g}_{2m}(s) \leq B \cdot \exp(qnR) \cdot \left[\sum_j \left(\sum_k p_k p_{jk}^{(1-s)/q} \right)^q \left(\sum_v p_v q_{jv}^s \right)^p \right]^n, \quad (39)$$

where

$$q \geq 1-s, p \geq s \geq 0, s < 1$$

and $R = \text{code rate}; R = n^{-1} \log M$.

The upper bounds for V_1, V_2 , averaged over the random choice of code words, are as follows:

$$\bar{V}_1 \leq B \cdot e^{n(Ts - pR)} \cdot \left[\sum_j \left(\sum_k p_k p_{jk}^{1-s} \right) \left(\sum_v p_v q_{jv}^{s/p} \right)^p \right]^n, \quad (40)$$

$$(M-1) \cdot \bar{V}_2 \leq B \cdot e^{n(qR - Ts)} \cdot \left[\sum_j \left[\sum_k p_k p_{jk}^{(1-s)/q} \right]^q \left[\sum_v p_v q_{jv}^s \right]^p \right]^n. \quad (41)$$

Note that the previous bounds (Equations 40 and 41) will converge exponentially to zero if the functions

$$f_1(s) = \sum_j \left(\sum_k p_k p_{jk}^{1-s} \right) \left(\sum_v p_v q_{jv}^{s/p} \right)^p, \quad 1 \geq p \geq s \geq 0 \quad (42)$$

and

$$f_2(s) = \sum_j \left[\sum_k p_k p_{jk}^{(1-s)/q} \right]^q \left(\sum_v p_v q_{jv}^s \right)^p, \quad q \geq 1-s, s \geq 0. \quad (43)$$

are both less than 1 for some $(s, p, q) = (s^o, p^o, q^o)$. This is a sufficient condition for both quantities $\overline{V}_1, \overline{V}_2$ to converge to zero for some random block code of size n , as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We observe that for any p , $f_1(0) = 1$ and for $q=1$, $f_2(0) = 1$.

A sufficient condition that both V_1 and V_2 converge exponentially to zero in spite of mismatch is that for a pair (P, Q) , we have the following:

$$\min f_1(s) \cdot (Ts - pR) < 1 , \quad (44)$$

$$\min f_2(s) \cdot (qR - Ts) < 1 , \quad (45)$$

where the *min* are over all three parameters (p, q, s) .

Due to the stated properties of $f_1(s)$, $f_2(s)$, it is always guaranteed that for P, Q sufficiently close, the bounds of Equations 40 and 41 will converge exponentially to zero as n becomes infinite.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

4. REFERENCES

- Blackwell, D., L. Breiman, and A. J. Thomasian. "The Capacities of Certain Channel Classes Under Random Coding." Annals of Mathematical Statistics, vol. 31, pp. 558-567, 1960.
- Fano, R. M. Transmission of Information. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1961.
- Forney, G. D., Jr. "Exponential Error Bounds for Erasure, List, and Decision Feedback Schemes." IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. IT-14, pp. 206-220, March 1968.
- Gallager, R. G. "A Simple Derivation of the Coding Theorem and Some Applications." IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. IT-11, pp. 3-18, January 1965.
- Kazakos, D. "Upper and Lower Error Bounds for Noisy Channel Coding Under Mismatch." Proceedings of 1981 Johns Hopkins Conference on Information Sciences and Systems, Baltimore, MD, 1981.
- Korevaar, J. Mathematical Methods. Vol. 1, New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- Shannon, C. E., and W. Weaver. The Mathematical Theory of Communication. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- Stiglitz, I. "A Coding Theorem for a Class of Unknown Channels." IEEE Transactions Information Theory, vol. IT-13, no. 2, April 1967.
- van Trees, H. Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory. Part I, New York: Wiley, 1968.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

No. of
Copies Organization

- 2 Administrator
Defense Technical Info Center
ATTN: DTIC-DDA
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22304-6145
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCAM
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: AMSLC-DL
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145
- 2 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-IMI-I
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 2 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-TDC
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Director
Benet Weapons Laboratory
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL
Watervliet, NY 12189-4050
- (Unclass. only)1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament, Munitions
and Chemical Command
ATTN: AMSMC-IMF-L
Rock Island, IL 61299-5000
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Aviation Research
and Technology Activity
ATTN: SAVRT-R (Library)
M/S 219-3
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Missile Command
ATTN: AMSMI-RD-CS-R (DOC)
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5010
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: ASQNC-TAC-DIT (Technical
Information Center)
Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Director
U.S. Army TRADOC Analysis Command
ATTN: ATRC-WSR
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502
- 1 Commandant
U.S. Army Field Artillery School
ATTN: ATSF-CSI
Ft. Sill, OK 73503-5000
- (Class. only)1 Commandant
U.S. Army Infantry School
ATTN: ATSH-CD (Security Mgr.)
Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
- (Unclass. only)1 Commandant
U.S. Army Infantry School
ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR
Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
- 1 Air Force Armament Laboratory
ATTN: WL/MNOI
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
- Aberdeen Proving Ground
- 2 Dir, USAMSAA
ATTN: AMXSY-D
AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen
- 1 Cdr, USATECOM
ATTN: AMSTE-TC
- 3 Cdr, CRDEC, AMCCOM
ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A
SMCCR-MU
SMCCR-MSI
- 1 Dir, VLAMO
ATTN: AMSLC-VL-D
- 10 Dir, BRL
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T

No. of Copies	Organization
1	Commander U.S. Army CECOM ATTN: AMSEL-RD-C3-AF-2, Charles Graff Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Commander U.S. Army CECOM ATTN: AMSEL-RD-C3-AC, P. Sass Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
2	Commander U.S. Army Research Office ATTN: SLCRO-EL, Dr. J. Gault SLCRO-MA, Dr. G. Andersen P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 22709-2211
1	Commander U.S. Army CECOM Center for Signals Research ATTN: AMSEL-SW, S. Rhodes Vint Hill Farm Station Warrenton, VA 22186-5100
1	Commandant U.S. Military Academy ATTN: MAJ Richard Hughes West Point, NY 10996
1	Commandant U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD 21404
1	Commandant U.S. Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, CO 80840
1	Director Naval Research Laboratory ATTN: Code 7521, Dr. J. E. Wieselthier Washington, DC 20375-5000
1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Intelligent Control Systems ATTN: Prof. Robert Gallager Cambridge, MA 02139

No. of Copies	Organization
2	University of Maryland Department of Electrical Engineering ATTN: Prof. Anthony Ephremides Prof. Evaggelos Geraniotis College Park, MD 20742
1	California Institute of Technology Department of Electrical Engineering ATTN: Prof. Rod Goodman Pasadena, CA 91125
3	The John Hopkins University Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering ATTN: Prof. Willis C. Gore Prof. Brian Hughes Prof. Oliver Collins Baltimore, MD 21218
1	University of Delaware Department of Electrical Engineering ATTN: Prof. Charles G. Bonclet, Jr. Newark, DE 19716
2	University of Delaware Department of Computer and Information Sciences ATTN: Prof. John Case, Chair Prof. Michael Paterakis Newark, DE 19716
3	University of Virginia Department of Electrical Engineering ATTN: Prof. Demetrios Kazakos Prof. P. Papantoni-Kazakos Prof. Stephen G. Wilson Charlottesville, VA 22903
1	The University of Hawaii at Manoa Department of Electrical Engineering ATTN: Prof. Shu Lin Honolulu, HI 96822
1	Northeastern University Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering ATTN: Prof. Charles T. Retter 329 Dana Bldg. 360 Huntington Avenue Boston, MA 02115

No. of

Copies Organization

1 Georgia Institute of Technology
Department of Electrical Engineering
ATTN: Prof. Stephen Wicker
Atlanta, GA 30322

No. of

Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Research, Development,
and Standardization Group
United Kingdom
USARDSG (UK) Box 65
FPO NY 09510
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Research, Development,
and Standardization Group
Australia
APO, SF 96404
- 1 Waseda University
Department of Industrial Engineering
ATTN: Prof. Shigeichi Hirasawa
3-4-1 Ohkubo, Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160
Japan
- 1 University of Wales at Bangor
School of Electronic Engineering
Science
ATTN: Prof. John O'Reilly
Dean Street, Bangor
Gwynedd LL57 1UT
UK
- 1 Hungarian Academy of Science
Math Institute
ATTN: Prof. Imre Csiszar
POB 127, H-1364
Budapest, Hungary
- 1 Linkoping University
Department of Electrical Engineering
ATTN: Prof. Thomas Ericson
S-582 83 Linkoping
Sweden
- 1 The University
Electrical Engineering Laboratories
ATTN: Prof. P. G. Farrell
Manchester ML3 9PL
England

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers below will aid us in our efforts.

1. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.) _____

2. How, specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.) _____

3. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided, or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate. _____

4. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.) _____

BRL Report Number BRL-TR-3307 Division Symbol _____

Check here if desire to be removed from distribution list. _____

Check here for address change. _____

Current address: Organization _____
Address _____

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT No 0001, APG, MD

Postage will be paid by addressee.

Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

